DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 186 HE 008 851

AUTHOR Popovich, Joseph J., Jr.
TITLE Nonresident Student Enrollment in Maryland Public Institutions of Higher Education. Report of Findings and Policies.
INSTITUTION Maryland State Board for Higher Education, Annapolis.
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 58p.
AVAILABLE FROM Maryland State Board for Higher Education, The Jeffrey Building, 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, Maryland 21401

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Educational Demand; Educational Facilities; Educational Quality; Educational Supply; *Enrollment; Enrollment Influences; Enrollment Trends; Fees; *Higher Education; *Nonresident Students; *Resident Students; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Students; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

National surveys have documented the substantial movement by students across state borders to attend both public and private institutions of higher education in states other than those in which they reside. This report provides data on the number of nonresident students in Maryland public institutions, the institutions they attend, and the levels of study at which they are enrolled. It also summarizes data regarding the admission of nonresidents and residents and the tuition and fee charges for both groups. An analysis is made of the impact of nonresidents on costs, educational quality, and utilization of facilities. Also reported is a summary of the methods used by other states to deal with the enrollment of nonresidents in their public institutions. Finally, Maryland State Board for Higher Education policies are presented for enrollment of nonresident students in Maryland public institutions of higher education. The recommendations deal with the specifics of the Board's efforts to limit full-time nonresident undergraduates to 15 percent as a general standard for four-year public institutions. (Author/JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED138186

MARYLAND STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Annapolis, Maryland

NONRESIDENT STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN MARYLAND PUBLIC INTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

REPORT OF FINDINGS AND POLICIES

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008851

February 1977

PREPARED BY JOSEPH J. POPOVICH, JR.

STATE OF MARYLAND

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

HARRY K. WELLS
Chairman

Richard R. Kline
Vice-Chairman

Thelma B. Cox
Secretary

J. Harrison Ager

Melvin M. Berger

William P. Chaffinch

Lucy Keker

Mary L. Nock

Philip Pear

Austin E. Penn

Dr. Henry C. Welcome

DR. SHELDON H. KNORR
Commissioner

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

DR. SHELDON H. KNORR
Commissioner

DR. MONTE P. SHEPLER
Deputy Commissioner

DR. GLENWOOD C. BROOKS, JR.
Director, Equal Educational Opportunity

DR. REYNOLDS FERRANTE
Director, Finance, Facilities and Programs

DR. FRANK SCHMIDTLEIN
Director, Research, Planning and Evaluation

FRED H. SPIGLER, JR.
Director, Special Programs and Community Service

EUGENE STANLEY
Director, Accreditation and Approval

Division of Equal Education Opportunity

JOAN LEWIS KINZER, Equal Educational Opportunity
MARGARET S. ROONEY, Desegregation Programs

Division of Finance, Facilities and Programs

LUCIE LAPOVSKY, Budget Analysis
K.G. ROBINSON, Facilities
DR. JOHN A. SABATINI, JR., Interstate & Inter-Institutional Relations
DR. HENRY F. VOLLMER, Academic Programs

Division of Research, Planning & Evaluation

JOHN E. CLAYTON, Systems Planning
DR. STEPHEN R. HAMPLE, Research
JOSEPH J. POPOVICH, JR., Master Planning

Division of Special Programs and Community Service

DOROTHY L. HOMEWOOD, Publications and Special Programs
FREDERICK E. PORTER, Fire-Rescue Education and Training
DAVID S. ROSENBERG, Continuing Education (Title I, HEA)

Division of Accreditation & Approval

DR. JOSEPH T. DURHAM, Collegiate Institutions
FRANK H. GOEDEKE, Proprietary Institutions

Administration

ROBERT CHESTER ROGERS, Finance
DR. DAVID E. SUMLER, Administrative Officer to the Commissioner

This report has been prepared in response to House Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 1976 Maryland General Assembly. House Joint Resolution No. 1 requested that the Maryland Council for Higher Education, predecessor to the State Board for Higher Education, study the nonresident enrollment situation in Maryland public institutions of higher education to assess the impact of these students on access by Maryland residents to quality higher education. The text of this resolution is quoted below.

A House Joint Resolution concerning

Out-of-State and Foreign Students in Maryland Institutions

For the purpose of requesting that the Maryland Council for Higher Education study the problem of out-of-state and foreign students in Maryland public colleges and universities.

The citizens of Maryland are fortunate in having a superior public higher education system. This system has been paid for with tax dollars by our citizens, and we can be justifiably proud of our efforts.

An important question now facing our public colleges and universities is how many out-of-state and foreign students can be admitted without jeopardizing the opportunities of Maryland students to get a quality education.

Although out-of-state and foreign students add to the diversity and cultural life of a college or university, the demand in our educational facilities is increasing at a large rate.

We must adopt uniform standards for out-of-state and foreign students, taking into consideration their contribution and the need for the space in our institutions to be used by qualified and deserving Maryland residents; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF MARYLAND, That the Maryland Council for Higher Education study the problem of

out-of-state and foreign students and to report their findings to the 1976 Legislative Council; and be it further

RESOLVED, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Governor and to the Board of Trustees of the State colleges

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	INTRODUCTION	1
I.	THE CURRENT ENROLLMENT PATTERN OF NONRESIDENT STUDENTS	2
II.	ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT RATES OF RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT STUDENTS	7
III.	TUITION AND FEES FOR RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT STUDENTS	9
IV.	IMPACT OF NONRESIDENTS ON COSTS AND QUALITY	11
V.	IMPACT OF NONRESIDENTS ON FACILITIES	15
VI.	STATE CONTROL OF NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENTS	16
VII.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	17
	RECOMMENDATIONS	20
	REFERENCES	22
	APPENDIX A: RESIDENCY STATUS OF TOTAL STUDENTS BY INSTITUTION AND LEVEL OF STUDY	
	APPENDIX B: APPLICATIONS, ADMISSIONS, ENROLLMENTS	
	APPENDIX C: FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND FEES	
	APPENDIX D: STATES WITH NONRESIDENT RESTRICTIONS	

National surveys have documented the substantial movement by students across state borders to attend both public and private institutions of higher education in states other than those in which they reside. Such surveys, conducted periodically, indicate the number of students crossing state lines to attend school has increased substantially since 1963, although this growth apparently has slowed somewhat in recent years. Maryland historically has exported more students to private institutions in other states than have entered the State to attend private colleges and universities. A recent survey indicated that Maryland is still one of many states whose residents attend institutions in other states in substantial numbers and which also receives significant numbers of students from other states. The latest information available shows that during the fall of 1975, about 3900 Maryland residents left the State and enrolled as first-time undergraduates in public and private institutions in 12 northeastern states. For the same period, about 3800 residents of these states enrolled as first-time undergraduates in institutions located in Maryland.[1] This study deals with those students who are residents of other states and foreign countries but attend public institutions of higher education in Maryland.

This report provides data on the number of nonresident students in Maryland public institutions, the institutions they attend, and the levels of study at which they are enrolled. It also summarizes data regarding the admission of nonresidents and residents and the tuition and fee charges for both groups. An analysis is made of the impact of nonresidents on costs, educational quality, and utilization of facilities. Also reported is a summary of the methods used by other states to deal with the enrollment of nonresidents in their public institutions. Finally, Board policies are presented for enrollment of nonresident students in Maryland public institutions of higher education.

I. THE CURRENT ENROLLMENT PATTERN OF NONRESIDENT STUDENTS

During the fall of 1975, the public institutions of higher education in Maryland (excluding the University College of the University of Maryland) enrolled 164,966 students. On a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis this amounted to 115,713 FTE students.[2] Residency information was available for 164,153 students and provides the basis for the enrollment analysis presented in this report. Institution-by-institution and segmental tabulations of students by residency status and by level of study are presented in Appendix A. Of the total students enrolled, 149,135 (90.9%) were Maryland residents, 10,959 (6.7%) were residents of another state, and 4,059 (2.5%) were residents of a foreign country.*

Percentages of nonresident students (out-of-state and foreign students combined) varied considerably among segments. Table I indicates the variation in residency status for students in the different segments. The University of Maryland enrolled the largest percentage of nonresidents (18.6%), the State colleges and universities enrolled 9.0% nonresident students, and the community colleges enrolled the smallest percentage of nonresidents (3.5%).

TABLE I
RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, BY SEGMENT
FALL 1975

RESIDENCE STATUS	UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	ALL * INSTITUTIONS
In-State	38,026 (81.4%)	37,413 (91.0)	73,696 (96.5%)	149,135 (90.9%)
Out-Of-State	6,961 (14.9%)	3,078 (7.5%)	920 (1.2%)	10,959 (6.7%)
Foreign	1,721 (3.7%)	608 (1.5%)	1,730 (2.3%)	4,059 (2.5%)
TOTAL	46,708	41,099	76,346	164,153

* Percentages do not sum to 100% due to rounding.

Percentages of nonresident students also varied according to the level of study involved. Table II summarizes these differences.

TABLE II
RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS, BY LEVEL OF STUDY
FALL 1975

RESIDENCE STATUS	UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	FIRST PROFESSIONAL	ALL LEVELS
In-State	133,645 (92.2%)	12,696 (78.1%)	2,794 (92.9%)	144,135 (90.9%)
Out-Of-State	7,822 (5.4%)	2,938 (18.1%)	199 (6.6%)	10,959 (6.7%)
Foreign	3,422 (2.4%)	621 (3.8%)	16 (0.5%)	4,059 (2.5%)
TOTAL	144,889	16,255	3,009	164,153

As indicated in Table II, the largest percentage of nonresident students was at the graduate level (21.9%) with lower percentages at the undergraduate (7.8%) and first-professional (7.1%) levels of study.

Despite the general Statewide tendency for relatively greater percentages of nonresident students at the University of Maryland (Table I) and at the graduate level of study (Table II), there are exceptions to these overall trends when both segment and level of study are considered together. Table III provides such a cross tabulation for the categories in Tables I and II. These seven categories are arranged in order according to the percentage of the nonresident students enrolled.

TABLE III
RANK ORDERING OF NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGES
BY LEVEL OF STUDY AND SEGMENT
FALL 1975

CATEGORY		% NONRESIDENTS
Undergraduates	- Community Colleges	3.5%
Graduate Students	- State Colleges and Universities	5.0%
First Professional	- State Colleges and Universities	5.6%
First Professional	- University of Maryland	7.9%
(TOTAL ALL CATEGORIES)		(9.2%)
Undergraduates	- State Colleges and Universities	10.1%
Undergraduates	- University of Maryland	14.8%
Graduate Students	- University of Maryland	37.6%

To a large extent, the differences in nonresident enrollment patterns among the categories in Table III appear to correspond to the traditional differences in the roles and missions of different types of institutions.

1. As would be expected, the community colleges, which are designed primarily to meet the needs of specific localities within the State, have the lowest percentage of nonresidents of any type of institution.

2. The University of Maryland, as a comprehensive university with a diverse mission and a national reputation draws the largest percentage of nonresident students of any segment. In this respect, the University appears to be similar to other large comprehensive institutions. A national survey of opening fall enrollments for fall, 1974 at major universities indicated that the University had about an average percentage of nonresident undergraduates at that time (14.1% for the University; 14.3% was average). For graduate and first-professional students combined, the University was somewhat above the average for that survey (48.8% for the University; 36.4% was average).[3] However, for fall, 1975, the nonresidents for these catagories at the University had declined to 31.9% (7.9% - first professional; 37.6% - graduate), which is below the average for the survey.

3. Intermediate between these two segments are the State Colleges and Universities which appear to have primarily statewide appeal at the undergraduate level. This is also true at the graduate level and most likely results from the fact that these institutions do not award the doctorate and place a good deal of emphasis on graduate programs designed to meet the needs of professional educators in the regions they serve.

Although the segments as a whole tend to have nonresident enrollment patterns which conform to what would be expected based on their overall

roles and missions, there is a good deal of difference among individual institutions within two of the segments as is indicated in Tables IV and V . Except for the community colleges, the range in nonresident enrollment percentage among institutions is fairly large. As already noted, a large doctoral-granting institution such as UMCP is likely to have a significant percentage of nonresidents enrolled. The other institutions with substantial percentages of nonresident students - UMES, Bowie, and Morgan - have different explanations for their nonresident enrollments. Morgan has traditionally had a national reputation within the Black Community. Bowie and UMES, on the other hand, have had a history of appeal to Black students in the regions in which they are located. To a large extent, this appeal to Black students is responsible for the significant percentages of nonresidents enrolled at these three institutions.

TABLE IV

RANK ORDERING OF NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGES
BY SEGMENT
FALL 1975

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	COMMUNITY COLLEGES
UMBC - 4.0%	Coppin - 3.0%	Chesapeake - 0.0%
UMAB - 12.2%	Towson - 3.1%	Dundalk - 0.0%
(SEGMENT AVERAGE - 18.6%)	U. of Balt.- 4.1%	Essex - 0.1%
UMCP - 21.1%	St. Mary's - 7.4%	Howard - 0.2%
UMES - 33.7%	Frostburg - 8.3%	Charles - 0.2%
	(SEGMENT AVERAGE - 9.0%)	Catonsville - 0.3%
	Salisbury - 14.7%	Frederick - 0.3%
	Morgan - 20.5%	Anne Arundel - 0.5%
	Bowie - 22.8%	Harford - 0.8%
		Cecil - 1.3%
		Baltimore - 1.5%
		Garrett - 1.6%
		Prince George's- 2.3%
		(SEGMENT AVERAGE - 3.5%)
		Hagerstown - 7.5%
		Allegany - 7.6%
		Montgomery -13.2%

TABLE V

RANK ORDERING OF NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENT PERCENTAGES
BY SEGMENT AND LEVEL OF STUDY
FALL 1975

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND		STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES	
UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE
UMBC - 3.6%	UMBC -22.1%	Coppin - 3.4%	Un.Balt - 0.0%
UMAB - 8.3%	UMAB -24.7%	Towson - 3.4%	Towson - 1.1%
(AVERAGE-14.8%)	(AVERAGE-37.6%)	Un.Balt. - 5.1%	Coppin - 1.2%
UMCP -16.5%	UMCP -39.9%	Frostburg- 7.0%	Morgan - 4.3%
UMES -33.7%		St.Mary's- 7.4%	(AVERAGE - 5.0%)
		(AVERAGE - 10.1%)	Bowie - 6.7%
		Salisbury- 13.0%	Frostburg-13.1%
		Morgan - 23.5%	Salisbury-23.2%
		Bowie - 31.9%	

II. ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENT RATES OF RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT STUDENTS

Public institutions in Maryland like most public institutions in other states have policies granting preferential admission consideration to State residents. While each institution has its own specific means for implementing this policy, the data available indicate that among all applicants, residents consistently are admitted and enrolled at higher rates than nonresidents. The actual number of students who applied, were admitted, and who enrolled are tabulated in Appendix B. Table VI is a summary of this data. Community Colleges are not considered because, as a result of their "Open Door" policy, they admitted virtually all applicants for the fall of 1975.

As indicated in Table VI, each institution accepted a greater percentage of residents who applied for admission than nonresidents who applied. For example, UMCP accepted 90.5% of Maryland residents who applied but only 74.4% of nonresidents who sought admission. Taking all institutions into consideration, the rate of acceptance generally ranged between 10% and 20% higher for resident applicants than for nonresident applicants. This suggests that the preferential admissions policies which exist at all institutions are effective in actual practice. In addition, the two institutions which had the highest acceptance rates for Maryland applicants (Bowie 100% and UMES 97.8%) also had high proportions of nonresidents enrolled. It, thus, appears that residents are not being denied access even though a substantial number of nonresidents are enrolled in these institutions.

In addition, Table VI shows that in most cases, resident students who have been admitted also tend to actually enroll at a higher rate than do nonresidents. The net effect of this difference and of the preferential admissions policies for residents is a differential between the enrollment rates of resident and nonresident applicants on the order of from about 10% to 30%.

Table VI

Admissions and Enrollment Rates
Full-Time Undergraduates - Fall, 1975

	% Admitted of Applicants	% Enrolled of Those Admitted	% Enrolled of Those Applying
UMBC			
Residents	87.1%	71.0%	61.8%
Nonresidents	67.2%	48.9%	32.8%
UMCP			
Residents	90.5%	57.2%	51.7%
Nonresidents	74.4%	33.0%	24.6%
UMES			
Residents	97.8%	58.9%	57.6%
Nonresidents	84.2%	38.8%	32.7%
BOWIE			
Residents	100%	50.3%	50.3%
Nonresidents	86.4%	45.5%	39.3%
COPPIN			
Residents	85.8%	73.3%	62.9%
Nonresidents	77.6%	71.1%	55.2%
SALISBURY			
Residents	93.9%	64.3%	60.4%
Nonresidents	83.5%	55.3%	46.2%
ST. MARY'S			
Residents	81.5%	61.1%	49.8%
Nonresidents	66.1%	72.4%	47.8%
TOWSON			
Residents	85.2%	81.8%	69.6%
Nonresidents	60.2%	65.8%	39.6%

NOTE: Morgan and Frostburg were not able to supply data.

UMAB and the University of Baltimore are not listed due to the fact that they did not admit any freshmen.

III. TUITION AND FEES FOR RESIDENT AND NONRESIDENT STUDENTS

Almost all public institutions of higher education in the United States charge nonresident students more for tuition and fees than they charge residents. There is, however, a great deal of variation in the actual amounts charged. Appendix C (Table C-1) lists resident and nonresident tuition charges for the fall of 1976 for 40 major doctoral-granting universities. Thirteen of these institutions charge more for resident undergraduate tuition and fees than does the University of Maryland at College Park. On the other hand, only four charge nonresidents more than does UMCP. Table C-2 lists 40 state colleges and universities which do not grant the doctorate. Among these, Maryland institutions range from about average to higher than average both for resident and nonresident tuition and fees.

All 4-year public institutions of higher education in Maryland charge nonresidents higher tuition and fees than they do State residents. At the community colleges, there are different tuition levels for county residents, for students from out-of-county but in State, and for those who are not Maryland residents. Appendix C (Table C-3) provides a summary of resident and nonresident tuition and fee levels for fall, 1975 and fall, 1976.

The data indicate that the differential between resident and nonresident charges is substantial at all institutions. For the 1976-77 academic year, the campuses of the University of Maryland charge nonresidents at least 178% more than is charged State residents. At the State colleges and universities, the minimum nonresident charge is 72% more. In the community college segment, the smallest differential is 88% more for out-of-county students and 147% more for out-of-state students.

The data in Table C-3 also indicate that the increases in tuition and fees that occurred between the fall of 1975 and the fall of 1976 (where

increases occurred) were greater for nonresident students than for residents in all cases. At the campuses of the University of Maryland, charges for nonresidents increased between $170 and $330 while those for residents increased between $40 and $110. At the State College and Universities, nonresident increases ranged between $140 and $440 while those for residents ranged between $20 and $130. In the Community College segment, increases for out-of-state students ranged between $90 and $532, those for out-of-county students between $50 and $245, and those for county residents between $8 and $100. On a percentage basis, the increases in four-year institutions tend to be higher than those reported in a recent national survey. The survey found that between 1975 and 1976, the median increase in tuition and fees was 10% for residents and 12.5% for nonresidents.[4] At the campuses of the University of Maryland, increases for residents ranged between 6% and 28% (median - 13%) and those for nonresidents between 9% and 34% (median - 14%). At the State colleges and universities, increases for residents ranged between 3% and 29% (median - 5.5%) and those for nonresidents between 11% and 64% (median - 26.5%).

IV. IMPACT OF NONRESIDENTS ON COSTS AND QUALITY

In order to assess the extent to which nonresidents impact on educational quality, it is appropriate to view graduate and undergraduate education separately.

Graduate education at comprehensive universities across the country is characterized by diverse student bodies and strong competition for national recognition. In order to establish a national reputation and to attract outstanding faculty, institutions compete for the best students, regardless of their residence. To a large extent, the success an institution has in recruiting high quality graduate students and faculty determines its ability to compete for grants from federal, foundation, and private sources. In addition, because of the cost and specialization of programs at the graduate level, no institution is economically able to offer the complete range of programs which is possible at the undergraduate level. The result is that there is a significant amount of interstate mobility among graduate students whose states of residence do not offer programs in their areas of interest. Due to these considerations, it would appear to be in the best interest of educational quality to encourage a significant amount of student body diversity at the graduate level.

At the undergraduate level, educational quality is also enhanced by having a diverse student body and by attracting students of high ability. However, because of the large size and the high total cost of undergraduate education, the benefits of having nonresidents on campus must be examined in light of the costs involved and an institution's ability to finance quality programs.

In order to evaluate the effect of nonresident undergraduates on instructional quality, it is useful to view the relationships between total costs per student, instructional costs per student, and the amount nonresidents pay in tuition and fee charges toward these costs. These

relationships are summarized in Table VII.

A. Column 1 indicates the total budgeted costs per full-time equivalent student for Fiscal Year 1977. This figure includes costs for instruction, administration, plant operations and maintenance, libraries, student services, and public safety. The percentage figure in parenthesis indicates the percentage of this total cost per student that is covered by the nonresident charges for each full-time nonresident undergraduate. As indicated, this percentage ranges between 37% and 90% of total cost per student.

B. Column 2 indicates the total instructional costs per full-time equivalent student. Again, the percentage figure indicates the percentage of per student cost that is covered by the nonresident charge for a full-time undergraduate. This percentage ranges between 94% and 159%. It seems reasonable to conclude that nonresidents in almost all cases are charged tuition and fees which are more than adequate for paying for the full cost of instruction. In other words, the State does not have to subsidize the cost of instructional activities for nonresidents in order to maintain present student-faculty ratios and present faculty salary levels.

In general, then, it appears that nonresident undergraduate fees are adequate for paying for more that the per-student instructional costs necessary to maintain present quality standards but less that the per-student total costs. However, on campuses where there is graduate instruction, costs per student are higher than they would be if only undergraduate instruction were offered. Therefore, nonresident undergraduate charges cover a larger percentage of the true undergraduate costs than is indicated in Table VII. Thus, it is likely that at UMCP (where nonresident charges cover 90% of total cost) and UMBC (where nonresident charges cover 88% of total cost), nonresidents are paying the full cost of undergraduate education. This does not appear to be the case at the other institutions.

Table VII

Nonresident Charges as a Percentage of Per Student

Total and Instructional Costs

INSTITUTION	Total Cost* Per FTE		Instructional* Cost per FTE		NonResident Charges
UMES	3798	(37%)	1435	(97%)	1390
ST. MARY'S	2519	(52%)	1204	(108%)	1300
COPPIN	2413	(55%)	1096	(121%)	1331
BOWIE	2618	(55%)	1275	(114%)	1450
UNIV. OF BALTIMORE	2043	(69%)	882	(159%)	1400
SALISBURY	2001	(62%)	1130	(110%)	1240
FROSTBURG	2101	(73%)	1245	(123%)	1526
MORGAN	2282	(63%)	1195	(120%)	1437
UMBC	2450	(88%)	1239	(173%)	2148
TOWSON	1952	(55%)	1152	(94%)	1078
UMCP	2378	(90%)	1425	(151%)	2148

*Total and instructional cost figures reflect costs for undergraduate and graduate students. Therefore, on campuses such as UMCP, where there is substantial graduate enrollment, the percentages shown above most likely understate significantly the extent to which tuition and fees cover the true undergraduate costs.

**UMAB is omitted because the high costs associated with health programs makes comparisons with tuition and fee charges difficult.

The above analysis provides an indication of the extent to which costs are covered by nonresident charges. It is also of interest to examine how the presence of nonresidents affects these costs. For activities other than instruction, there are minimum fixed costs which do not increase in proportion to increases in the size of the student body. For example, a classroom building has to be operated and maintained whether it is operating at its full capacity or at half its capacity. This means that costs for such activities tend to decrease on a per-student basis as the size of the student body increases, until an institution is operating at its capacity. Or, from another point of view, a reduction in the size of the student body would not be expected to result in a proportionate reduction in costs because many fixed costs would still remain. A detailed analysis of each institution's budget would be required to accurately separate fixed and variable costs. Such analysis was beyond the scope of this study. However, it seems reasonable to assume that, for a given institution, a reduction in the number of nonresident students without a corresponding increase in residents would have the effect of increasing unit costs, particularly for non-instructional activities.

V. IMPACT ON FACILITIES

One assumption made in concluding that the costs per student tend to decrease with increasing student body size is that an institution's physical capacity is not overtaxed. If this situation occurs, inefficiencies can be expected and unit costs would most likely begin to rise. On the other hand, it could not be considered economically sound to construct additional facilities in order to relieve overcrowding caused mainly by the presence of nonresident students.

An analysis that has been carried out of institutional physical plant capacity indicates that enough plant is available in the aggregate at 4-year institutions to meet enrollment increases which are projected to occur through about 1984 and beyond. This same analysis also notes the problems of financing the rapidly increasing costs of plant operation and maintenance.[5] It seems reasonable to expect that at institutions where adequate plant capacity presently exists or is projected to exist in the near future, nonresident students can serve a desirable purpose. Nonresidents students permit institutions to build facilities for projected needs and, in the interim, to permit the sharing of the costs of operating these facilities among a greater number of students by utilizing their capacity to a greater extent. Because enrollments are expected to grow for the next several years, nonresident students can aid in the more efficient present utilization of facilities at institutions which have facilities in excess of current needs.

VI. STATE CONTROL OF NONRESIDENT ENROLLMENTS

Two policies which have been established in all states for control of nonresident enrollments in public institutions have been discussed: preferential admissions policies for residents and higher tuition and fee levels for nonresidents. A recent national survey indicated that most states had not taken additional measures to regulate nonresident enrollments. It was found that over two-thirds of the states had no state-level policy with respect to the control of the number of nonresidents permitted to attend public institutions. Somewhat less than a third of the states were found to have some type of quota system. The vast majority of such systems were found to be administered by a state coordinating agency or governing board. The survey also found that there was some tendency among states who had imposed quotas to reassess such policies in view of the prospect of limited enrollment growth in the future.[6] A state-by-state tabulation of the results of this survey is at Appendix D.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data and analysis presented in this report deal with various aspects of the nonresident student situation in Maryland public institutions of higher education. The major findings and conclusions are summarized below.

1. National data indicate that a substantial number of residents of Maryland attend institutions of higher education in other states and that a significant number of nonresidents attend school in Maryland. In the public sector, about 9% of students enrolled in Maryland institutions are nonresidents. Institutions with the largest percentages of nonresident students are the University of Maryland-College Park, the University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, Bowie, and Morgan.

2. Nonresident enrollment at UMCP appears to be about average for a major doctoral-granting institution at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Morgan has a national Black constituency and UMES and Bowie have regional Black constituencies which accounts for their higher-than-average percentages of nonresidents.

3. Institutional policies which give preferential admission to Maryland residents appear to be effective in practice. In all institutions, undergraduate admission and enrollment rates for residents are higher than for nonresidents. Those institutions which had the highest percentage of nonresident students were also those which had the highest acceptance rates of Maryland applicants. As a result, it generally does not appear that qualified Maryland residents are being denied access to higher education due to the presence of nonresident students.

4. Maryland public institutions, like most in other states, assess higher tuition and fees for nonresidents than for residents. The nonresident undergraduate charges at the University of Maryland-College

Park are among the very highest in the nation for comparable institutions. Nonresident charges at the other 4-year schools are at least average or higher compared to similar institutions in other states. At all Maryland institutions, the differences between resident and nonresident charges is substantial. In addition, during the past two years, nonresident charges have risen by considerably greater amounts than have resident charges, and charges for both have generally risen at a greater rate than the national average.

5. At the graduate level, comprehensive universities must attract students of high ability and outstanding faculty in order to successfully compete for national recognition and funds from non-State sources. In addition, financial constraints limit the number of graduate programs any single institution can offer. For these reasons, a diverse graduate student body is to be expected and encouraged if the quality of an institution's programs and its reputation are to be enhanced.

6. At the undergraduate level, diversity is also desirable but is not of the overriding importance that it is for graduate programs. Because of the magnitude of the undergraduate education enterprise, the extent to which nonresidents pay for their education is of interest. In general, nonresidents are assessed high enough tuition and fee charges to pay for the full cost of their instruction. They do not, however, generally pay the full cost for all activities except, perhaps, at UMCP and UMBC.

7. In general, overhead costs per student decrease as institutional size increases. Institutions can best take advantage of potential economies of scale by increasing the sizes of their student bodies up to their capacities. Nonresident students permit institutions to take advantage of such economies by permitting them to operate nearer capacity. Therefore, decreasing student body size through the reduction of the number of nonresidents, would be expected to increase operating costs per student and

at the same time to disproportionally decrease student revenues available through nonresident tuition and fees for paying for these costs.

8. Because enrollments are projected to increase for the next several years, physical plant capacity adequate for future needs has been built to a large extent and is presently available for use. The presence of nonresident students permits institutions to utilize their required future plant capacities more efficiently at the present time.

9. Almost all states have policies which require preferential admission for residents and higher tuition and fee charges for nonresidents. In addition, about a third of the states have adopted some type of formal quota system for controlling nonresident enrollments. For the most part, these quota systems are administered by state coordinating agencies or governing boards.

POLICIES OF THE STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

1. It is the responsibility of the Maryland State Board for Higher Education to ensure that residents of the State have access to quality higher education. The Board will utilize its powers of budget review and master planning to ensure that nonresident students do not jeopardize access by residents and that they do not impact adversely on educational quality. The Board shall issue reports on the nonresident student situation and on its actions on this issue as appropriate.

2. Due to the nature of graduate education, it is reasonable to expect and encourage a diverse graduate student body. Therefore, it is not appropriate under present circumstances to impose any restrictions on nonresident graduate student enrollments.

3. A 15% limit on full-time nonresident undergraduate students is desirable as a general standard for four-year public institutions at this time. However, the impact of this standard shall be examined on an institution-by-institution basis to determine if there is justification for any temporary modification of this standard in individual cases.

A 15% standard appears to be the norm for institutions with national reputations and would therefore not be expected to harm the national or regional status of any institutions. At the same time, the data and analysis presented in this report indicate that the nonresident enrollment situation is a complex one and one which varies significantly from institution to institution. Dealing with this issue on an institutional basis provides the flexibility necessary for taking advantage of the potential economies which may be realized from the presence of nonresident students while ensuring that higher education access and quality for State residents is not

jeopardized. Specific factors which vary from school to school and which should be taken into account are: the enrollment potential among residents in the immediate region served; the demand for admission from State residents; the nature of the region and constituents served; institutional role and mission; extent of facility utilization; and, the potential for increased efficiencies and decreased costs to resident students and to the State.

4. For the purpose of future facilities requests, the Board shall base the enrollment projections for such requests on the current (1976-77) percentage of full-time nonresident undergraduate students enrolled at each institution. In no case will this percentage exceed 15%. However, the impact of these standards shall be examined on a case-by-case basis to determine if these standards should be modified due to circumstances that may require special attention.

Adoption of this limit ensures that facilities are built to accomodate primarily Maryland residents and that plant capacity is not added in anticipation of greater than the 15% level of nonresident enrollments. This restriction is also appropriate in view of the prospect of modest growth in enrollments in the future and the necessity to guard against overbuilding of facilities.

REFERENCES

1. (a) Wade, George H. Residence and Migration of College Students, U.S. Office of Education, 1970.

(b) National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education, Unpublished data for fall, 1975.

2. Maryland Council for Higher Education, Annual Report and Recommendations, 1976, Annapolis, Maryland.

3. Jay L. Chronister and E. Davis Martin, Nonresident Student Enrollment in State Institutions of Higher Education: An Overview, 1975, Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Center for the Study of Higher Education.

4. The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 15, 1976.

5. MCHE, Annual Report and Recommendations, 1976.

6. Chronister and Martin, Nonresident Student Enrollment in State Institutions of Higher Education: An Overview.

APPENDIX A

Residency Status of Total Students

By Segment, Institution, and Level of Study

Fall, 1975

APPENDIX A

RESIDENCE OF STUDENTS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS
BY SEGMENT AND LEVEL OF STUDY
FALL 1975

Univ. of Maryland	Undergraduate	Graduate	First Professional	Total
In-State	30,927 (85.2%)	5,254 (62.4%)	1,845 (92.1%)	38,026 (81.4%)
Out-of-State	4,232 (11.7%)	2,586 (30.7%)	143 (7.1%)	6,961 (14.9%)
Foreign	1,126 (3.1%)	579 (6.9%)	16 (0.8%)	1,721 (3.7%)
Total	36,285	8,419	2,004	46,708
State Colleges * & Universities				
In-State	29,022 (90.0%)	7,442 (95.0%)	949 (94.4%)	37,413 (91.0%)
Out-of-State	2,670 (8.3%)	352 (4.5%)	56 (5.6%)	3,078 (7.5%)
Foreign	566 (1.8%)	42 (0.5%)	--	608 (1.5%)
Total	32,258	7,836	1,005	41,099
Community Colleges				
In-State	73,696 (96.5%)			73,696 (96.5%)
Out-of-State	920 (1.2%)			920 (1.2%)
Foreign	1,730 (2.3%)			1,730 (2.3%)
Total	76,346			76,346
Total All Segments				
In-State	133,645 (92.2%)	12,696 (78.1%)	2,794 (92.9%)	149,135 (90.9%)
Out-of-State	7,822 (5.4%)	2,938 (18.1%)	199 (6.6%)	10,959 (6.7%)
Foreign	3,422 (2.4%)	621 (3.8%)	16 (0.5%)	4,059 (2.5%)
Total	144,889	16,255	3,009	164,153

---

* NOTE. If only the six institutions governed by the Board of Trustees of the State Universities and Colleges are considered, the following totals result.

In-State	23,847 (92.6%)	6,494 (94.4%)	949 (94.4%)	31,290 (93.1%)
Out-of-State	1,488 (5.8%)	329 (4.8%)	56 (5.6%)	1,873 (5.6%)
Foreign	421 (1.6%)	22 (0.3%)	--	443 (1.3%)
Total	25,756	6,845	1,005	33,606

APPENDIX A

RESIDENCY STATUS OF TOTAL STUDENTS, BY INSTITUTION AND LEVEL OF STUDY
FALL, 1975

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

		UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	FIRST PROFESSIONAL	ALL LEVELS
UMAB *	In-State	1087 (91.7%)	801 (75.3%)	1,845 (92.1%)	3733 (87.8%)
	Out-Of State	76 (6.7%)	218 (20.5%)	143 (7.1%)	437 (10.3%)
	Foreign	19 (1.6%)	45 (4.2%)	16 (0.8%)	80 (1.9%)
	TOTAL	1185	1064	2,004	4250
UMBC	In-State	5255 (96.5%)	134 (77.9%)		5389 (95.9%)
	Out-of- State	90 (1.7%)	36 (20.9%)		126 (2.2%)
	Foreign	101 (1.9%)	2 (1.2%)		103 (1.8%)
	TOTAL	5446	172		5618
UMCP	In-State	23,853 (83.5%)	4319 (60.1%)		28,172 (78.8%)
	Out-of-State	3,794 (13.3%)	2332 (32.5%)		6,126 (17.1%)
	Foreign	907 (3.2%)	532 (7.4%)		1,439 (4.0%)
	TOTAL	28,554	7,183		35,737
UMES	In-State	732 (66.4%)			732 (66.4%)
	Out-of-State	272 (24.7%)			272 (24.7%)
	Foreign	99 (9.0%)			99 (9.0%)
	TOTAL	1103			1103
TOTAL	In-State	30,927 (85.2%)	5,254 (62.4%)	1,845 (92.1%)	38,026 (81.4%)
	Out-of-State	4,232 (11.7%)	2,586 (30.7%)	143 (7.1%)	6,961 (14.4%)
	Foreign	1,126 (3.1%)	579 (6.9%)	16 (0.8%)	1,721 (3.7%)
	TOTAL	36,285	8,419	2,004	46,708

* Total does not include 92 residents and 290 nonresidents (all undergraduates) who are students in the Walter Reed Army Institute of Nursing and Mercy Hospital Clinical Center Programs. These programs are offered by the University through contractual arrangements and are self-supporting.

Source: MCHE Form S-3 Fall, 1975.

STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

		UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	TOTAL
BOWIE	In-State	1332 (68.1%)	1031 (93.3%)	2363 (77.2%)
	Out-of-State	498 (25.5%)	67 (6.1%)	565 (18.5%)
	Foreign	126 (6.4%)	7 (0.6%)	133 (4.3%)
	TOTAL	1956	1105	3061
COPPIN	In-State	2287 (96.6%)	510 (98.8%)	2797 (97.0%)
	Out-of-State	28 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	28 (1.0%)
	Foreign	52 (2.2%)	6 (1.2%)	58 (2.0%)
	TOTAL	2367	516	2883
FROSTBURG	In-State	2660 (92.9%)	629 (86.9%)	3289 (91.7%)
	Out-of-State	195 (6.8%)	95 (13.1%)	290 (8.1%)
	Foreign	7 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (0.2%)
	TOTAL	2862	724	3586
MORGAN	In-State	4024 (76.5%)	948 (95.7%)	4972 (79.6%)
	Out-of-State	1095 (20.8%)	23 (2.3%)	1118 (17.9%)
	Foreign	140 (2.7%)	20 (2.0%)	160 (2.6%)
	TOTAL	5259	991	6250
SALISBURY	In-State	2709 (87.0%)	486 (76.8%)	3195 (85.3%)
	Out-of-State	388 (12.5%)	141 (22.3%)	529 (14.1%)
	Foreign	17 (0.5%)	6 (0.9%)	23 (0.6%)
	TOTAL	3114	633	3747
ST. MARY'S	In-State	1151 (92.6%)		1151 (92.6%)
	Out-of-State	87 (7.0%)		87 (7.0%)
	Foreign	5 (0.4%)		5 (0.4%)
	TOTAL	1243		1243

		UNDERGRADUATE	GRADUATE	FIRST PROFESSIONAL	TOTAL
TOWSON	In-State	11,261 (96.5%)	2658 (98.9%)		13,919 (97.0%)
	Out-of-State	343 (2.9%)	26 (1.0%)		369 (2.6%)
	Foreign	64 (0.5%)	3 (0.1%)		67 (0.5%)
	TOTAL	11,668	2687		14,355
UNIV. OF BALTIMORE	In-State	3,598 (95.0%)	1180 (100%)	949 (94.4%)	5,727 (95.9%)
	Out-of-State	36 (1.0%)	---	56 (5.6%)	92 (1.5%)
	Foreign	155 (4.1%)	---	--	155 (2.6%)
	TOTAL	3,789	1180	1005	5,974

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ALLEGANY		
In-State	1505	(92.4%)
Out-of-State	123	(7.6%)
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	1628	

ANNE ARUNDEL		
In-State	5641	(99.5%)
Out-of-State	2	(0.0%)
Foreign	27	(0.5%)
TOTAL	5670	

CATONSVILLE		
In-State	9872	(99.7%)
Out-of-State	23	(0.2%)
Foreign	10	(0.1%)
TOTAL	9905	

CECIL		
In-State	1358	(98.7%)
Out-of-State	18	(1.3%)
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	1376	

CHARLES		
In-State	2109	(99.7%)
Out-of-State	5	(0.2%)
Foreign	1	(0.0%)
TOTAL	2115	

CHESAPEAKE		
In-State	721	(100%)
Out-of-State	0	
Foreign	0	
TOTAL	721	

COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF BALTIMORE		
In-State	9509	(98.5%)
Out-of-State	46	(0.5%)
Foreign	101	(1.0%)
TOTAL	9656	

DUNDALK		
In-State	2092	(100%)
Out-of-State	---	
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	2092	

ESSEX		
In-State	8720	(99.9%)
Out-of-State	---	
Foreign	7	(0.1%)
TOTAL	8727	

FREDERICK		
In-State	1769	(99.7%)
Out-of-State	6	(0.3%)
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	1775	

GARRETT		
In-State	440	(98.4%)
Out-of-State	7	(1.6%)
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	447	

HAGERSTOWN		
In-State	1780	(92.5%)
Out-of-State	144	(7.5%)
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	1924	

HARFORD		
In-State	3155	(99.2%)
Out-of-State	25	(0.8%)
Foreign	---	
TOTAL	3180	

HOWARD		
In-State	1964	(99.8%)
Out-of-State	2	(0.1%)
Foreign	2	(0.1%)
TOTAL	1968	

MONTGOMERY		
In-State	12,063	(86.7%)
Out-of-State	338	(2.4%)
Foreign	1,506	(10.8%)
TOTAL	13,907	

PRINCE GEORGES		
In-State	10,998	(97.7%)
Out-of State	181	(1.6%)
Foreign	76	(0.7%)
TOTAL	11,255	

Appendix B

Applications, Admissions, Enrollments

First-Time Undergraduates

Table B-1

Applications, Admissions, Enrollments
Residents and Nonresident - Fall, 1975
First-Time Undergraduates

	No. of Applicants	No. of Applicants Admitted	No. Enrolled of Admitted Students
UMAB			
Residents			
Nonresidents		(No Freshmen Admitted)	
UMBC			
Residents	2376	2069	1468
Nonresidents	131	88	43
UMCP			
Residents	8707	7879	4503
Nonresidents	4369	3252	1074
UMES			
Residents	271	265	156
Nonresidents	260	219	85
BOWIE			
Residents	467	467	235
Nonresidents	369	319	145
COPPIN			
Residents	939	806	591
Nonresidents	58	45	32
SALISBURY			
Residents	1007	946	608
Nonresidents	182	152	84
ST. MARY'S			
Residents	558	455	278
Nonresidents	115	76	55
TOWSON			
Residents	2863	2439	1994
Nonresidents	374	225	148
UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE			
Residents			
Nonresidents		(No Freshmen Admitted)	

Note: Morgan and Frostburg were not able to supply data.

Source: MCHE Form S-3, Fall, 1975.

APPENDIX C

Full-Time Undergraduate Tuition and Fees

Institutions in Various States and in Maryland

Table C-1

Full-Time Undergraduate Tuition and Fees - Fall, 1976

State Universities Which Grant Doctorate

INSTITUTION	Resident Tuition and Fees	Nonresident Tuition and Fees
Univ. of Arizona	450	1640
Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville	400	930
Univ. of California - Berkeley	637	2137
Univ. of California - Los Angeles	630	2130
Univ. of Colorado	531	2123
Univ. of Connecticut - Storrs	815 *	1865
Univ. of Delaware	795 *	1930
Univ. of Florida	880 *	1915
Univ. of Georgia - Athens	615	1479
Univ. of Hawaii - Manoa	478	1153
Univ. of Idaho	400	1400
Indiana University - Bloomington	1094 *	2012
Univ. of Iowa	682	1550
Univ. of Kansas	576	1366
Univ. of Kentucky	480	1210
Univ. of Maine - Orono	725	1850
Univ. of Md. - College Park	758	2148
Michigan State University	832 *	1777
Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis	840 *	2150 *
Univ. of Mississippi	950 *	1650
Univ. of Nebraska - Lincoln	663	1563
Univ. of New Hampshire	1039 *	2739 *
Rutgers State University	735	1320
Univ. of New Mexico	520	1516
State Univ. of New York - Buffalo	810 *	1235
Univ of North Carolina - Chapel Hill	450	2100
Univ. of North Dakota, Grand Forks	525	1225
Ohio State University	810 *	1860
Univ. of Oklahoma	500	1332
Pennsylvania State University	1095 *	2295 *
Univ. of Rhode Island	895 *	1945
Univ. of South Carolina - Columbia	658	1418
Univ. of South Dakota	835 *	1535
Univ. of Tennessee - Knoxville	453	1305
Univ. of Texas - Austin	559	1639
Univ. of Utah	525	1335
Univ. of Virginia	750	1650
Univ. of Washington	564	1581
Univ. of Wisconsin - Madison	660	2315 *
Univ. of Wyoming	434	1400

*Indicates those institutions which charge more than UMCP

Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 5, 1976.

Table C-2

Full-Time Undergraduate Tuition and Fees - Fall, 1976

State Colleges and Universities not Granting Doctorate

INSTITUTION	Resident Tuition and Fees	Nonresident Tuition and Fees
Alabama A and M University	410	660
Arkansas State University	400	700
Southern State (Arkansas) College	410	680
California State College - Sacramento	200	1500 *
California State College - Long Beach	190	1490 *
Eastern Connecticut State College	610	1510 *
Delaware State College	398	973
Florida A and M University	645	2085 *
Georgia Southern College	486	1134
University of Hawaii - HiLo	102	922
Boise (Idaho) State University	362	1402 *
Eastern Illinois University	790 *	1636 *
Western Illinois University	573	1421 *
University of Northern Iowa	630	1200
Fort Hays Kansas State College	530	1030
Eastern Kentucky University	440	970
Grambling State (Louisiana) University	415	1045
Worcester (Mass.) State College	600	1200
Central Michigan University	674	1574 *
Moorhead (Minnesota) State University	564	1008
Kearney (Nebraska) State College	568	900
Central Missouri State University	315	915
Jersey City State College	706 *	1241
Stockton (N.J.) State College	701 *	1236
State University of N.Y. College at Buffalo	770 *	1195
Fayetteville (N.C.) State University	526	1672 *
Mayville (N.D.) State College	470	1010
Wright State (Ohio) University	780 *	1680 *
Central State (Oklahoma) University	335	835
California (Penn.) State College	990 *	1690 *
Bloomsburg (Penn.) State College	930 *	1630 *
Rhode Island College	700 *	1550 *
South Carolina State College	500	980
Dakota State College (South Dakota)	675	1240
Tennessee State University	406	1258
West Texas State University	470	1550 *
Madison (Virginia) College	700 *	1200
Longwood (Virginia) College	805 *	1255
Central Washington State College	507	1359 *
Bluefield (W. Va.) State College	306	1206

*Indicates those institutions which charge more than the Maryland average

Unweighted average tuition and fees for Maryland Institutions -
Residents - 685
Nonresidents - 1345

Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 5, 1976.

Table G-3

Resident and Nonresident Charges - Maryland - Fall, 1975-76

University of Maryland

		Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Year Change
UMAB				
	Resident	$650	$760	$110
	Nonresident	1950	2190	240
	% Differential	200%	188%	
UMBC				
	Resident	698	758	60
	Nonresident	1848	2148	300
	% Differential	165%	183%	
UMCP				
	Resident	718	758	40
	Nonresident	1978	2148	170
	% Differential	175%	183%	
UMES				
	Resident	390	500	110
	Nonresident	1040	1390	350
	% Differential	167%	178%	

SOURCE: Admissions and Financial Aid Information, Maryland Council for Higher Education, 1975.

Admissions and Financial Aid Information, Maryland State Board for Higher Education, 1976.

NOTE: Where institutions reported credit hour costs, 30 hours were considered the normal annual load for an undergraduate for computing tuition and fee charges.

State Colleges and Universities

INSTITUTION	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	1 Year Change
BOWIE			
Resident	620	750	130
Nonresident	1070	1450	380
% Differential	73%	93%	
COPPIN			
Resident	552	632	80
Nonresident	1002	1331	329
% Differential	82%	111%	
FROSTBURG			
Resident	726	826	100
Nonresident	1176	1526	350
% Differential	62%	85%	
MORGAN			
Resident	737	757	20
Nonresident	1187	1437	250
% Differential	61%	90%	
ST. MARY'S			
Resident	610	600	-10
Nonresident	860	1300	440
% Differential	41%	117%	
SALISBURY			
Resident	560	590	30
Nonresident	1010	1240	230
% Differential	80%	110%	
TOWSON			
Resident	628	628	0
Nonresident	1078	1078	0
% Differential	72%	72%	
UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE			
Resident	660	700	40
Nonresident	1260	1400	140
% Differential	91%	100%	

INSTITUTION	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	1 Year Change
ALLEGANY			
In County	350	350	0
Out-of-County	750	750	0
% Differential	114%	114%	
Out-of-State	1450	1450	0
% Differential	314%	314%	
ANNE ARUNDEL			
In County	430	430	0
Out-of-County	910	910	0
% Differential	112%	112%	
Out-of-State	1630	1630	0
% Differential	279%	279%	
CATONSVILLE			
In County	300	340	40
Out-of-County	600	726	126
% Differential	100%	114%	
Out-of-State	1200	1588	388
% Differential	300%	367%	
CECIL			
In County	339	339	0
Out-of-County	639	639	0
% Differential	88%	88%	
Out-of-State	1039	1039	0
% Differential	206%	206%	
CHARLES			
In County	390	480	90
Out-of-County	750	960	210
% Differential	92%	100%	
Out-of-State	1110	1440	330
% Differential	185%	200%	
CHESAPEAKE			
In County	340	400	60
Out-of-County	700	800	100
% Differential	106%	100%	
Out-of-State	2000	2364	364
% Differential	488%	491%	

INSTITUTION	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	1 Year Change
CCB			
In County	342	373	31
Out-of-County	656	733	77
% Differential	92%	97%	
Out-of-State	972	1093	121
% Differential	184%	193%	
DUNDALK			
In County	300	360	60
Out-of-County	600	770	170
% Differential	100%	114%	
Out-of-State	1200	1684	484
% Differential	300%	368%	
ESSEX			
In County	300	370	70
Out-of-County	600	792	192
% Differential	100%	114%	
Out-of-State	1200	1732	532
% Differential	300%	368%	
FREDERICK			
In County	300	375	75
Out-of-County	600	750	150
% Differential	100%	100%	
Out-of-State	1200	1500	300
% Differential	300%	300%	
GARRETT			
In County	340	340	0
Out-of-County	640	640	0
% Differential	88%	88%	
Out-of-State	840	840	0
% Differential	147%	147%	
HAGERSTOWN			
In County	336	386	50
Out-of-County	786	836	50
% Differential	134%	117%	
Out-of-State	1236	1386	150
% Differential	268%	259%	
HARFORD			
In County	430	438	8
Out-of-County	955	990	35
% Differential	122%	126%	
Out-of-State	1635	1662	27
% Differential	280%	279%	

INSTITUTION	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	1 Year Change
HOWARD			
In County	350	360	10
Out-of-County	650	720	70
% Differential	86%	100%	
Out-of-State	1150	1240	90
% Differential	229%	244 %	
MONTGOMERY			
In County	500	500	0
Out-of-County	1320	1320	0
% Differential	164%	164%	
Out-of-State	1700	1700	0
% Differential	240%	240%	
PRINCE GEORGE'S			
In County	390	390	0
Out-of-County	900	900	0
% Differential	131%	131%	
Out-of-State	1590	1590	0
% Differential	308%	308%	

APPENDIX D

STATES WITH NONRESIDENT RESTRICTIONS

STATE RESTRCTIONS ON NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS*

State	Restriction	Agency Responsible For Enforcing Restriction
Alabama	None	
Alaska	None	
Arizona	27.5	Arizona Board of Regents
Arkansas	None	
Colorado	15%	Colorado Commission on Higher Education
Connecticut	None	
Delaware	25%	Legislature
Florida	10%	State University System of Florida
Georgia	None	
Hawaii	10% Community Colleges 20% University Campus	Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii
Illinois	None	
Indiana	None	

*The information in this table has been excerpted from Nonresident Student Enrollment in State Institutions of Higher Education: An Overview, by Jay L. Chronister and E. Davis Martin, 1975.

State	Restriction	Agency Responsible For Enforcing Restriction
Iowa	None	
Kansas	15%	State Coordinating Board
Louisiana	None	
Maine	None	
Maryland	None	
Massachusettes	None	
Michigan	20%	Legislature
Mississippi	None	
Missouri	15%	The Missouri Commission on Higher Education
Montana	Nonresident may not be admitted if he displaces a resident	Montana Board of Regents
Nebraska	None	
Nevada	None	
New Hampshire	25%	Legislature
New Jersey	5% State Colleges 10% Rutgers	
New Mexico	None	
New York	None	

State	Restriction	Agency Responsible For Enforcing Restriction
North Carolina	15%	Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina
North Dakota	None	
Ohio	20%	Ohio Board of Regents
Oklahoma	None	
Oregon	15-16%	State Coordinating Board
Pennsylvania	5%	State Policy
Rhode Island	None	
South Carolina	None	
South Dakota	None	
Tennessee	15%	Tennessee Higher Education Commission
Texas	None	
Utah	None	
Vermont	None	
Virginia	None	
Washington	None	
West Virginia	None	
Wyoming	None	

Copies of this report may be obtained at no charge by writing the Maryland State Board for Higher Education at the following address:

The Jeffrey Building

16 Francis Street

Annapolis, Maryland 21401